Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:
Summer Nutrition Status Report 2010

Food Research and Action Center | June 2010

Executive Summary

The Summer Nutrition Programs, which provide nutritious meals and snacks to low-income children during the summer months, are in trouble and are falling far short of meeting the needs of low-income children. Only one in six of the low-income students who depended on the National School Lunch Program during the regular 2008-2009 school year had access to summer meals in 2009. The limited reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs meant that for the majority of those children, the end of the school year was the end of the healthy, filling meals they counted on, and meant as well a summer of struggling to avoid going hungry.

The recession not only has impacted families, it has severely strained state and local budgets, resulting in major cuts in summer schools and youth programs throughout the country. The erosion of programs where food can be served makes it difficult for the Summer Nutrition Programs to respond to the dramatic increase in need. Contrary to the overall trend in federal nutrition programs, in 2009 the Summer Nutrition Programs actually fed fewer children than in the previous year.

If low-income children are going to have access to the healthy food they need during the summer months, the Summer Nutrition Programs must be improved.

Key Findings for 2009

- In July 2009, the Summer Nutrition Programs (i.e., the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program combined) only served lunch to 2.8 million children on an average day. The total number of children participating in Summer Nutrition fell by 73,000, or 2.5 percent, from July 2008 to July 2009.
- One key way to measure the effectiveness of the Summer Nutrition Programs is to compare the number of low-income children eating during the summer to those eating during the normal school year. In July 2009, only 16.1 children received Summer Nutrition for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the 2008-2009 school year. Only one in six children who needed summer food, according to this measure, was getting it. The 2009 ratio was a significant decrease when compared to a ratio of 17.3:100 children in July 2008 and 21.1:100 in 2001.
- The story behind the overall numbers shows the impact of the recession on this program. In many states, budget cuts caused school districts to eliminate or reduce their summer programs, resulting in 102,000 fewer students being served by the National School Lunch Program in July 2009 than in the previous year. The losses in this program overwhelmed the gain of 29,000 children achieved by the Summer Food Service Program.
- California's budget crisis had an outsized effect on the national trend both because of California's sheer size, and the fact that it historically has had relatively strong Summer Nutrition Programs, especially in schools. California's total program loss of 78,000 children was larger than the total national decrease in Summer Nutrition participation. Other states also suffered big losses, however. Participation in Louisiana, South Carolina, Kentucky, Hawaii, and Utah fell by more than 15 percent.
- Despite state budget challenges nationwide, the top

performing eight states managed to reach at least one in four of their low-income children in July 2009, with the District of Columbia reaching four out of five children. Unfortunately, 11 states served less than one-tenth of their low-income children through their Summer Nutrition Programs in 2009, with two states – Oklahoma and Mississippi - serving just 1 in 20.

- If every state in July 2009 had reached the goal of serving 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the 2008-2009 school year, an additional 4.2 million children would have been fed each day, and the states would have collected an additional $289 million in child nutrition funding.

Child Nutrition Reauthorization

The current Child Nutrition Reauthorization process gives Congress the opportunity to fix problems in the Summer Nutrition Programs (some of them created by previous congressional budget cuts), and to make targeted new investments that will increase the number of children who have access to nutritious meals during the summer. Needed changes include:

- Improving the area eligibility test so that more children from low-income families are able to participate;
- Expanding to all states the Year-Round Summer Food Pilot, currently only in effect in California, which reduces paperwork and eases administrative requirements for community-based sponsors that serve children during both the summer and after school during the school year;
- Providing grants to sponsors for start-up and expansion costs and transportation of children in order to bring new sponsors into the program and allow existing sponsors to serve more children; and
- Restoring reimbursement rates to prior levels before cuts, so that schools, local government agencies, and private nonprofit organizations are able to operate the program without losing money and can provide healthier food.

About FRAC
The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and undernutrition.

For more information about FRAC, or to sign up for FRAC's Weekly News Digest, visit www.frac.org. For information about out-of-school time programs, including the Summer Nutrition Programs, go to www.frac.org/afterschool/.

Acknowledgements
This report was prepared by Rachel Cooper and Crystal FitzSimons.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges the following funders whose major support in 2009-2010 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs:

Anonymous Donors
The Atlantic Philanthropies
California Endowment
Annie E. Casey Foundation
The Claneil Foundation
ConAgra Foods Foundation
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
General Mills Foundation
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Kaiser Permanente
Kraft Foods
Land O'Lakes Foundation
Leaves of Grass Fund
A.L. Mailman Family Foundation
MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger
The Moriah Fund
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
National Dairy Council / Dairy Management, Inc.
New Prospect Foundation
Presbyterian Hunger Program
Pritzker Early Childhood Foundation
Sara Lee Foundation
UPS Foundation
Walmart Foundation

Introduction

As the Great Recession devastated the finances of millions of Americans in 2009, record numbers of families turned to the safety net of federal nutrition programs for help in feeding their children. Nearly one in three of America's school children, 17.5 million students, depended on the National School Lunch Program for free or reduced-price meals every day during the 2008-2009 school year. But for the majority of those children, the end of the school year also meant the end of the healthy, filling meals they counted on and a summer of struggling to avoid going hungry.

For decades the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the School Breakfast Program (SBP) have been the backbone of efforts to prevent child hunger during the regular school year. How to fill this food gap and provide children from low-income families the kind of nutritious meals and snacks in the summer that they receive during the school year has always been a challenge. The Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the NSLP provide healthy meals to low-income children during the summer months in an effort to fill this gap. Both programs (FRAC describes them together in this report as the Summer Nutrition Programs) provide meals to children participating at schools, nonprofit community sites, summer camps and other sites throughout the community.

When they are available, the Summer Nutrition Programs not only fight hunger, but they have other important benefits for children:

- Research finds that children gain more weight during the summer. Summer Nutrition Programs can help to combat childhood obesity. They provide foods that meet federal nutrition standards, thus providing many children well-balanced meals that are nutritionally superior to the meals they would consume on their own.

- Summer Nutrition Programs also support quality summer programs for children and teens that keep them safe, learning, engaged, and active during the summer months, reducing the loss of learning that often happens to children during the long summer break. The food provided through the Summer Nutrition Programs helps draw the children into quality summer programs and provides the nutrition necessary for children to be fully engaged throughout the program.

But despite their important role in fighting childhood hunger, obesity and summer learning loss, the Summer Nutrition Programs are in trouble and are falling far short of meeting the needs of low-income children. This was true before 2009. But the recession then not only impacted families; it also severely strained state and local budgets, resulting in major cuts in summer schools and youth programs throughout the country. When programs do not exist through which summer food can be served, more children go hungry. This is what happened in 2009. Counter to every other federal nutrition program, in 2009 the Summer Nutrition Programs actually fed fewer children than in the previous year. In July 2009, the Summer Nutrition Programs served lunch to only 2.8 million children on an average day, or one in twenty school children, compared to the regular year school lunch program which served one in three.

If low-income children are going to have access to the healthy food they need during the summer months, the Summer Nutrition Programs must be improved.

The Summer Nutrition Programs

The two federal Summer Nutrition Programs—the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)—provide funding to serve meals and snacks to children: at sites where at least half the children in the geographic area are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; at sites in which at least 50 percent of the children participating in the program are individually determined eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; and at sites that serve primarily migrant children. Once the site is eligible, all of the children can eat for free. Some summer camps also can participate.

The NSLP also reimburses schools for feeding children who attend summer school. Public and private nonprofit schools, local governments, National Youth Sports Programs, and private nonprofit organizations can participate in the SFSP and operate one or multiple sites. Only schools are eligible to participate in the NSLP (but they can use the NSLP to provide meals and snacks to non-school as well as school sites over the summer).

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) provides the funding through a state agency in each state—usually the state department of education.

Key Findings for 2009

National Participation

Even as the recession produced growing numbers of struggling families and food insecure and hungry children, the number of children receiving summer nutrition help fell. In July 2009, only 2.8 million children participated in the Summer Nutrition Programs (i.e., the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) combined) on the average weekday. This number was 73,000 children, or 2.5 percent, fewer than in July 2008.

This drop reverses the gains that were made from 2007 to 2008 when participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs grew by almost 50,000 children (the combination of an increase of 124,000 in the SFSP and a decrease in NSLP of 75,000). The growth in 2008 was due to the nationwide implementation of the Simplified Summer Food Program rules (which makes SFSP more attractive to sponsors by reducing administrative work) and the hard work on the part of advocates, sponsors and program officials finally beginning to pay off.

In both 2008 and 2009 SFSP participation grew while NSLP participation declined compared to the prior year, but in each program the numbers were weaker in 2009. As a result, the 2008 to 2009 NSLP drop swamped the SFSP growth:

SFSP and NSLP Participation Change

Year	SFSP	NSLP	Total
2007 to 2008	124,375	-74,579	49,796
2008 to 2009	29,361	-102,387	-73,026

Recession-fueled state budget cuts to educational and youth service programs seem to have driven these numbers and summer school and school-based summer program cuts seem to have predominated - ten states show this trend. In Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Nevada, and Virginia, the increases in SFSP were not enough to offset the decreases in NSLP participation. In California, both SFSP and NSLP participation fell, but the numerical drop in NSLP was huge—accounting for more than half of the national drop.

National Rates

The number of low-income children who are receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the regular school year is an excellent indicator of the need for the Summer Nutrition Programs, and so FRAC uses it as a benchmark to measure summer participation nationally and in the states. During the 2008-2009 school year, because the school lunch program responded to the growing need of families struggling due to the recession, the number of low-income children receiving help from the school lunch program grew substantially. Compared to the previous year, an additional 796,000 low-income children turned to free and reduced-price school lunches in the regular 2008-2009 school year, for a total of 17.5 million children served on the average school day.

Since the number of children eating during the school year grew significantly, and the number of children being fed during the summer fell, the share of children in need who were reached by the Summer Nutrition Programs decreased dramatically. In July 2009, only 16.1 children, or one in six, received Summer Nutrition for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the regular 2008-2009 school year, compared to a ratio of 17.3:100 children in July 2008 and 21.1:100 at the beginning of the decade, in 2001.

California: State Budget Cuts Hurt the Program

In 2009, 78,000 fewer children participated in the summer nutrition programs than in 2008, a 13.3 percent drop. California's huge budget deficit and the resulting deep funding cuts were the primary cause of the decrease. Many school districts were forced to reduce or eliminate summer school, leaving fewer schools providing summer meals. Since over 80 percent of children in California who receive summer meals do so through the National School Lunch Program, the loss of summer school programs had a significant impact on participation. Unfortunately, the state's increase in Summer Food Service Program sponsors (up 12.1 percent) and sites (up 22.7 percent) was not enough to counter the decrease in school participation.

Participation in the States

While participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs fell nationally, the performance of the programs varied dramatically throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Even with budget cuts closing school sites, the increased need led to 29 states actually experiencing growth in their Summer Nutrition Programs—17 states posted double digit increases. West Virginia led the way with a 24.8 percent increase in the number of children served by the Summer Nutrition Programs in

July 2009, compared to 2008, followed by Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi and Montana.

There were especially large percentage decreases in Utah, Hawaii, Kentucky, South Carolina and Louisiana. California had a smaller percentage loss (13.3 percent) but both because of its sheer size, and the fact that it historically has had relatively strong Summer Nutrition Programs, especially in schools, California's budget crisis had an outsized effect on the national summer nutrition trend.

The states that did manage to increase participation were able to make the Summer Nutrition Programs better respond to the growing need within their state. Most of these states were able to increase the number of sponsors and sites, increasing access to summer meals in communities. A number of high-performing state agencies and anti-hunger and community advocates engaged in aggressive outreach to inform families about the availability of the program.

Percent Change in the Number of Children Participating in Summer Nutrition 2008 to 2009

State	Change
Top 5 States	
West Virginia	24.8%
Maryland	17.4%
Minnesota	15.1%
Mississippi	14.8%
Montana	14.6%
Bottom 5 States	
Louisiana	-15.1%
South Carolina	-15.8%
Kentucky	-16.5%
Hawaii	-38.0%
Utah	-38.4%

***For a full list of states see Table 1**.

When comparing states' ratios of participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs to the regular school year, there are wide disparities. The top performing eight states managed to reach at least one in four of their low-income children in July 2009, with the District of Columbia reaching four out of five children. Unfortunately, 11 states served less than one-tenth of their low-income children through their Summer Nutrition Programs in 2009, with two states – Oklahoma and Mississippi - serving just 1 in 20.

West Virginia: Using Outreach to Grow Participation

In 2009, an aggressive outreach campaign to both sponsors and families by West Virginia's Summer Nutrition Programs led to a 24.8 percent increase in participation. More faith-based organizations were recruited to sponsor the Summer Food Service Program, and new sites were added. Many of the new and existing SFSP sponsors increased their community outreach to families to let them know about the program. The schools also served almost 2,000 additional children in NSLP thanks to local school boards aggressively promoting the availability of summer meals.

Children in Summer Nutrition in 2009 per 100 Children in Free & Reduced-Price School Year National School Lunch Program 2008-2009

State	Ratio
Top 5 States	
District of Columbia	79.7
New Mexico	34.3
Nevada	30.8
New York	30.1
Delaware	29.3
Bottom 5 States	
Colorado	6.9
Louisiana	6.7
Kansas	6.4
Mississippi	5.0
Oklahoma	4.9

***For a full list of states see Table 1.**

The Cost of Low Participation

At a time of fiscal crisis, not only are states with low Summer Nutrition participation rates failing to provide for their low-income children, they are also missing out on the millions of dollars in federal funds that exist to provide healthy foods for these children. For each day that a state failed to serve a low-income child a lunch during the summer of 2009, the state lost $3.13 in federal SFSP funding (more for rural or "self-preparation" sites). These dollars not only reduce hunger and boost nutrition; they also support summer programs for children and youth and can help stimulate the economy.

To estimate the total dollars being forfeited by the states in unclaimed Summer Nutrition funding, FRAC uses a benchmark for the ratio of low-income children that states should be reaching. Based on the performance of the most effective states, the goal of serving 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 children receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the regular school year is certainly achievable, if states commit the

necessary effort and resources. By calculating the additional number of children that would be fed by each state if this goal were met, and multiplying it by the federal reimbursement rate for the 22 weekdays in July 2009 (not counting the July 4th holiday), an estimate of the federal funding being lost by each state can be calculated.

If every state in July 2009 had reached the goal of serving 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the 2008-2009 school year, an additional 4.2 million children would have been fed each day, and the states would have collected an additional $289 million in child nutrition funding.

Top Ten States in Lost Federal Funds (Amounts Foregone Because State Falls Short of Reaching 40 Children in the Summer Nutrition Programs per 100 Free & Reduced-Price Students in the Regular Year School Lunch Program)

State	Additional Children	Dollars Lost
Texas	659,400	$45,406,263
California	392,900	$27,055,081
Florida	267,256	$18,403,275
Georgia	190,247	$13,100,401
Illinois	170,537	$11,743,176
Ohio	155,775	$10,726,643
North Carolina	155,332	$10,696,192
Michigan	131,333	$9,043,593
Arizona	129,854	$8,941,764
Louisiana	120,989	$8,331,274

***For a full list of states see Table 6.**

While the losses were higher in states with larger populations (e.g., $45.4 million in Texas, $27.1 million in California, $18.4 million in Florida and $13.1 million in Georgia), 20 states each lost more than $5 million in federal funding.

Of course, the Summer Nutrition Programs are meant to be available throughout the entire summer recess—not just in the month of July. States are losing out on even more federal dollars due to low participation rates in June and August.

Participation Throughout the Summer

As children need to know they can eat a healthy meal every day, Summer Nutrition Programs should be available from the first day of summer vacation until the start of the new school year. Unfortunately even before the fiscal crisis, many summer food sites did not stay open for the entire summer break and this problem continued and may have worsened in 2009. This is often due to inadequate funding, labor restrictions, or limited programming. Therefore, participation rates fluctuate throughout the summer.

In calculating the Summer Nutrition participation ratios used in this report, FRAC focuses on data from the month of July because it is the peak month for Summer Nutrition participation for most states. And as school schedules vary widely across the country, it is also the month when the vast majority of schools are closed.

While June data are not used in calculations for this report, it is important to note that 19 states have their peak participation in Summer Nutrition Programs during the month of June. Some states—Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Mississippi, Louisiana and Arizona—served more than twice the number of SFSP meals in June as July (see Table 5). In every state the number of meals served in August dropped substantially.

Summer Food Standards of Excellence

FRAC's Summer Food Standards of Excellence provide criteria for strengthening and improving the nutrition quality and appeal of the food, the environment of the site, and outreach to increase participation. The Standards provide a way to honor high quality programs that have moved beyond the federal requirements and to encourage additional programs to move in that direction. Below are two Summer Food sponsors that are meeting the Standards of Excellence:

Foodlink, the food bank serving Central and Western New York, makes nutrition quality its highest priority in the Summer Food Service Program. Its Summer Food sites meet FRAC's Summer Food Standards of Excellence "Gold" criteria. More than 50 percent of the grains offered are whole, and only low-fat milk is provided. Their family-style meal service helps keep food at the correct temperature, reduces packaging and waste, and builds a sense of community among the children. The fresh fruits and vegetables Foodlink serves are all fresh, and the majority are locally-grown. This summer, in addition to meals, Foodlink will send a nutrition educator to its summer food sites around the city of Rochester.

Thompson Ecumenical Empowerment Group in Thompson, Connecticut, achieves FRAC's Summer Food Standards of Excellence "Silver" level. Their menus vary from week to week and incorporate a variety of nutritious yet kid-friendly menu items, including Chef's and Chicken Caesar salads. Fresh fruits and vegetables are often offered. As a "self prep" sponsor, Thompson Ecumenical Empowerment Group prepares its own meals. They provide activities for children at their site, supported in part by grants from End Hunger CT!.

For more information on Foodlink's and Thompson Ecumenical Empowerment's programs and the standards of Excellence, visit http://www.frac.org/afterschool/standards.htm.

Child Nutrition Reauthorization: Congress' Opportunity to Increase Participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs

The fact that only one in six low-income children participates in the programs demonstrates the inability of the Summer Nutrition Programs to respond to the current economic crisis, and the ongoing barriers to reaching hungry children in the summer. This highlights the need for Congressional action to improve and strengthen the Summer Nutrition Programs.

Several key factors make it difficult for the programs to serve all of the low-income children who need nutritious meals and snacks during the summer. It is much harder to serve children nutritious meals when they are not in school, and there are too few summer programs in low-income communities. In addition, Congress has inflicted a series of critical blows over the years on the Summer Nutrition Programs that have decreased the number of sponsors and sites, and made it harder to grow participation in the programs. These cuts include: reducing the number of communities that are eligible to participate, lowering the reimbursement rates, and eliminating start-up and expansion funding.

Fortunately, Congress is now poised to reauthorize the federal child nutrition programs, including the Summer Nutrition Programs and the Administration and members of Congress are seeking a significant increase in funding. It is critical that Congress invest a fair share of these new dollars into expanding the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs so that more low-income children have access to summer meals that stave off hunger, help reduce obesity, and support and draw children into educational and enrichment programs that keep them learning throughout the summer.

Congress should include the following recommendations in Child Nutrition Reauthorization.

Improve the Area Eligibility Test

Under current rules, too many communities with large numbers of low-income children are not eligible for the Summer Nutrition Programs. This is because the best, easiest, and most frequently used way that sites qualify for the Summer Nutrition Program is through "area eligibility." If a program is located in a low-income area (as defined by school data or Census data), then the site can participate and receive federal reimbursement for all the children who eat at the site. The current definition for low-income requires that 50 percent of the children in the area be eligible for free or reduced-price school meals. Many millions of low-income children, however, live in communities that do not meet the 50 percent requirement. By setting the threshold at 40 percent, FRAC estimates that an additional 333,000 children will participate in the summer nutrition programs, a 12 percent increase over current participation.

Improving the area eligibility test also will allow many more federally-funded summer programs that serve low-income children to participate. For example, the threshold is 40 percent for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program (the largest federal funding source for the underlying costs of summer and after-school programs) and for Title I-funded school-wide summer and afterschool programs. Since the Summer Nutrition Programs are intended to support exactly these types of education programs, the inconsistency is self-defeating. The federal dollars intended to cover the programmatic costs of providing educational and enrichment activities for low-income children are spent on food instead. Or, these programs may not offer food at all, preventing low-income children from receiving the nutrition their bodies need in order to continue learning throughout the summer.

In addition, making this change will help reverse a previous cut to the SFSP that caused a significant drop in participation. Prior to 1981, the area eligibility threshold in the SFSP was 33 percent. Raising it from 33 percent to 50 percent made many communities ineligible for the Summer Nutrition Programs even though they still had significant numbers of low-income children. They simply lacked a large enough concentration of poverty. The change caused participation to drop by 500,000 children from 1981 to 1982.

Restore the Reimbursement Rate Cuts

The SFSP reimbursement rates were cut by 10 percent in 1996, making it extremely difficult for SFSP sponsors to participate in the program without losing money. A USDA report on summer food found that 73 percent of sponsors expect to lose money operating SFSP. Since summer meals are only available in communities where a school, local government agency, or private nonprofit organization takes on the responsibility of sponsoring SFSP, it is important that the reimbursement rates are high enough that sponsors can break even. The lower reimbursement rates make it extremely challenging to recruit new sponsors, especially during an economic crisis when schools, local government agencies and private nonprofits are struggling financially and cutting budgets and programs. It is time to restore the reimbursement rates to their pre-1996 levels, indexed to inflation, so that more communities have sponsors operating the program.

Expand the Year-Round Summer Food Pilot

Paperwork within SFSP frequently is cited by potential sponsors as a primary reason for not sponsoring the

program, and it is often mentioned when sponsors leave the program. Compounding the burdensome paperwork requirements of SFSP is the fact that many organizations operate both summer and regular school year afterschool programs and are forced to operate two separate child nutrition programs—one during the summer and one during the school year in order to feed the children year-round. Faced with having to apply for two separate programs with somewhat inconsistent rules, many do not operate either. The 2004 Child Nutrition Reauthorization included a pilot that allows community-based programs in California to feed children year-round through the Summer Food Service Program. The pilot significantly reduces administrative work. The reauthorization should expand the pilot nationwide and strengthen it so that more children can receive meals after school, on weekends, and during school holidays.

Provide Grant Funding to Strengthen and Expand Summer Nutrition

Currently, the Summer Nutrition Programs provide no additional funding beyond the reimbursements. Yet, there are a number of additional costs that keep the programs from serving the children who need them. Grant funding to cover the one-time or special costs that are not covered by the reimbursements would help increase participation.

- Start-up and expansion costs. Start-up funds were available until 1996. They gave sponsors the resources necessary to begin and grow their programs. Without these dollars, it is extremely difficult to recruit new sponsors and to encourage current sponsors to serve additional sites, both of which are necessary in order to increase participation.

- Transportation costs. In rural areas, transportation is one of the biggest barriers to Summer Nutrition participation due to the distances that children must travel to get to a site. Providing funding to get children to Summer Nutrition Programs that offer high quality educational and enrichment activities is a vital way to support access in rural areas.

Expand Quality Summer Programs for Low-Income Children though Other Legislative Opportunities

Summer programs for low-income children provide the foundation for successfully delivering nutritious meals. As long as there is not enough funding to support the underlying summer programs for low-income children, it will be difficult to expand the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs. Congress should look beyond the Child Nutrition Reauthorization, and invest in quality summer programs for low-income children and youth. This funding will support both summer learning and nutrition, countering the summer learning loss that low-income children experience at a much higher rate than their higher income peers, helping keep children safe and engaged over the summer and allowing them to return to school in the fall ready to learn.

Technical Notes

The data in this report are collected from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and an annual survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by FRAC. This report does not include Summer Nutrition Programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Department of Defense schools.

Due to rounding, totals in the tables may not add up to 100 percent.

Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP lunches served in each state. FRAC calculated each state's July average daily lunch attendance in the SFSP by dividing the total number of SFSP lunches served by the total number of weekdays (excluding the Independence Day holiday) in July.

FRAC uses July data because it is problematic to use the months of June or August for analysis. It is impossible to determine for those months how many days were regular school days, and how many days schools actually closed for the summer recess. And because of the limits of the available USDA data, it is not possible to separate National School Lunch Program data to determine if meals were served as part of the summer program or as part of the regular school year.

The average daily lunch attendance numbers for July reported in FRAC's analysis are slightly different from the average daily participation numbers reported by USDA. FRAC's revised measure allows consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. This measure is also more in line with the average daily lunch attendance numbers in the school year NSLP, as described below.

The numbers of lunches served by state are from USDA.

USDA obtains the July numbers of sponsors and sites from the states and reports them as they receive them. It does not report the number of sponsors or sites for June or August.

For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the data on sponsors, sites, and total number of lunches for June, July, and August that FRAC obtained from USDA. Their changes are included.

National School Lunch Program

Using data provided by USDA, FRAC calculated the school year NSLP average daily low-income attendance for each state based on the number of free and reduced-price meals served from September through May.

FRAC used the July average daily attendance figures provided by USDA for the summertime NSLP participation data in the report.

The NSLP meal numbers include the lunches served at summer school and through the NSLP Seamless Summer Option, as well as the regular summer NSLP lunches.

Note that USDA calculates average daily *participation* in the NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch attendance by a factor of 0.927. This is to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC's *School Breakfast Scorecard* reports the NSLP average daily *participation* numbers—that is, including the 0.927 factor. To make the NSLP numbers consistent with the summer food numbers, for which there is no analogous absenteeism factor, the *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation 2010* report does not include the absenteeism factor. As a result, the regular school year NSLP numbers in this report do not match the NSLP numbers in the *School Breakfast Scorecard School Year 2008-2009.*

The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving Summer Nutrition for every 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the regular school year. FRAC then calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if each state reached a 40 to 100 ratio of summer nutrition to regular school year lunches. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the reimbursement rate for 22 days (the number of weekdays in July 2009 not counting the July 4th holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available.

Summer Nutrition Legislation by State

Types of state summer nutrition legislation included in this table:

State Mandate (M) – State law requiring that all or certain schools offer the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)
State Funding ($) – State funds for a purpose related to SFSP
Reporting Requirement (R) – State law that state, schools or districts convene advisory group, and/or report participation or reasons for nonparticipation in SFSP

STATE		DETAILS
Alabama		NONE
Alaska		NONE
Arizona		NONE
Arkansas		NONE
California	$	Grants of up to $15,000 are available per school, on a competitive basis, up to the annual appropriation, for summer nutrition program or breakfast program start-up and expansion expenses where 20 percent or more of students are approved for F&RP meals. CAL. EDUC. CODE § 49550.3.
	$	The state allocated $0.2195 in additional reimbursement for each free and reduced-price meal served by a school through NSLP, including those served under the Seamless Summer Option. During May and June 2009, the appropriation for this funding was reduced to $0.0436 due to a lack of funding. CAL Ed Code § 49430.5.
	M	Existing law requires all schools to offer meals to needy students during summer school. Recent legislation limited the allowable exemptions, which brought more schools under the mandate. CAL Ed Code § 49548.
Colorado		NONE
Connecticut		NONE
Delaware		NONE
District of Columbia		NONE
Florida	M	Each school district is required to sponsor a summer nutrition program that operates at least one site within 5 miles of at least one elementary school at which 50 percent or more of the students are free or reduced-price eligible, and at least one site within 10 miles of every other elementary school in which 50 percent or more of the students are free or reduced-price eligible. Districts may only seek an exemption from the mandate by voting on the issue at a school board meeting that provides the opportunity for public comment. The school board must reconsider each year. FLA. STAT. Ch 1006.0606.
Georgia		NONE
Hawaii		NONE
Idaho		NONE
Illinois	M	All school districts (regardless of whether or not they already participate in a federal child nutrition program) must implement a summer breakfast and/or lunch program for the duration of the summer school program in all schools in which 50 percent or more of the student population is eligible for free or reduced-price meals AND that operate a summer school program. Public Act 096-0734 amends the Childhood Hunger Relief Act (105 ILCS 126/20).
Indiana		NONE
Iowa		NONE
Kansas		NONE
Kentucky		NONE
Louisiana		NONE

State Mandate (M)		State Funding ($)	Reporting Requirement (R)
Maine		NONE	
Maryland	M	If the public school system operates summer school, it must provide a meal program (can be breakfast, lunch, or breakfast and lunch). MD. CODE ANN., EDUC. § 7-603,	
Massachusetts	$	In total for 2009, $5,621,724 million total was allocated for breakfast and summer outreach, start up and expansion grants, and reimbursements. Of that, a minimum of $300,000 is allocated for SFSP outreach.	
Michigan		NONE	
Minnesota	$	State contributes $150,000 in additional funds for education department-approved SFSP sponsors to supplement federal reimbursement rates: up to 4 cents per breakfast, 14 cents per lunch or supper, and 10 cents per snack. MINN. STAT. § 124D.119.	
Mississippi		NONE	
Missouri	M	SFSP required in school districts where 50 percent or more of the children are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and in service institutions where more than 40 children congregate; districts can request a waiver. MO. REV. STAT. §191.810.	
Montana		NONE	
Nebraska		NONE	
Nevada		NONE	
New Hampshire		NONE	
New Jersey		NONE	
New Mexico		NONE	
New York	$	State allocates $3,049,410 to SFSP sponsors to supplement all summer breakfasts, lunches, suppers and snacks claimed for federal funds. This allocation also provides a per meal rate for sponsors serving and claiming a fourth meal supplement.	
North Carolina		NONE	
North Dakota		NONE	
Ohio	M	The governing body for each school that is required to provide student intervention programs during the summer months shall establish an extension of the School Breakfast Program and the National School Lunch Program or participate in the Summer Food Service Program. Schools may opt out for financial reasons and ask for a waiver from the State Board of Education. If the governing board decides that it cannot comply, it shall communicate its decision to the residents of the district. OHIO REV. CODE ANN. 3313.813; 3314.18.	
Oklahoma		NONE	
Oregon	$	State appropriates $150,000 (over two years) for reimbursements for summer lunches. The Department of Education supplements the federal reimbursement with 5 cents per lunch served during the summer as part of SFSP or NSLP. OR STAT 327.527.	
Pennsylvania		NONE	
Rhode Island		NONE	
South Carolina		NONE	
South Dakota		NONE	
Tennessee		NONE	
Texas	M	School districts are required to offer SFSP where more than 60 percent of children are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. TEX. HUM. RES. CODE § 33.024 (1993).	
Utah		NONE	
Vermont	$	The state allocated $51,387 for SFSP in 2009. Sponsors can use the funds either as reimbursement supplements or for activities and/or transportation in order to promote the program. The Department of Education encourages sponsors to use the funds for activities and/or transportation.	
Virginia		NONE	

State Mandate (M)	State Funding ($)	Reporting Requirement (R)
Washington	M	If the public school district operates a summer program and fifty percent or more of the students enrolled in the school qualify for free or reduced-price meals, the school district must implement a summer food service program in each of the operating public schools. Sites providing the meals should be open to all children in the area unless a compelling case can be made to limit access to the program. Schools may be exempt from implementing the Summer Food Service Program if they can demonstrate the availability of an adequate alternative summer feeding program. WA. LEGIS 287 (2005)
	$	State allocates $100,000 to support SFSP sponsors that participated during the previous summer. The funding is distributed based upon the proportion of the meals each sponsor served during the previous summer.
	$	For the summer of 2009 the state advanced $70,000 for grants for start up, expansion, equipment, or other costs.
West Virginia	NONE	
Wisconsin	NONE	
Wyoming	NONE	

TABLE 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2008 and July 2009 by State (Lunches in Summer Food Service Program - SFSP - and National School Lunch Program - NSLP - Combined)**

State	*July 2008 Summer Nutrition*				*July 2009 Summer Nutrition*				
	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 07-08 School Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 07-08 School Year NSLP*	Rank	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 08-09 School Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 08-09 School Year NSLP*	Rank	Percent Change in Summer Nutrition 2008 to 2009
Alabama	29,187	327,310	8.9	45	26,471	337,535	7.8	46	-9.3%
Alaska	2,887	31,664	9.1	44	3,285	32,950	10.0	40	13.8%
Arizona	41,617	394,285	10.6	38	37,253	417,767	8.9	44	-10.5%
Arkansas	21,618	214,219	10.1	40	23,993	222,448	10.8	38	11.0%
California	588,175	2,144,923	27.4	7	509,710	2,256,524	22.6	11	-13.3%
Colorado	15,008	184,112	8.2	47	13,781	200,213	6.9	47	-8.2%
Connecticut	33,434	132,985	25.1	10	35,429	137,467	25.8	8	6.0%
Delaware	11,593	40,478	28.6	6	12,874	43,866	29.3	5	11.1%
District of Columbia	26,198	29,518	88.8	1	24,897	31,256	79.7	1	-5.0%
Florida	153,673	968,060	15.9	24	144,916	1,030,432	14.1	29	-5.7%
Georgia	100,473	722,667	13.9	29	112,583	757,075	14.9	26	12.1%
Hawaii	10,623	44,366	23.9	12	6,589	47,621	13.8	31	-38.0%
Idaho	20,874	82,312	25.4	8	23,002	87,565	26.3	6	10.2%
Illinois	109,852	661,651	16.6	22	105,031	688,919	15.2	25	-4.4%
Indiana	45,829	339,180	13.5	33	44,870	367,061	12.2	35	-2.1%
Iowa	11,512	136,472	8.4	46	13,089	142,262	9.2	43	13.7%
Kansas	10,421	152,547	6.8	49	10,311	161,850	6.4	49	-1.1%
Kentucky	40,508	293,511	13.8	30	33,825	315,694	10.7	39	-16.5%
Louisiana	28,689	353,752	8.1	48	24,360	363,372	6.7	48	-15.1%
Maine	7,820	50,537	15.5	26	8,638	52,580	16.4	23	10.5%
Maryland	46,097	212,257	21.7	15	54,115	223,245	24.2	10	17.4%
Massachusetts	47,715	230,129	20.7	17	47,286	239,517	19.7	15	-0.9%
Michigan	62,425	470,108	13.3	34	71,185	506,294	14.1	29	14.0%
Minnesota	28,249	215,137	13.1	35	32,505	223,227	14.6	27	15.1%
Mississippi	12,400	279,534	4.4	51	14,235	286,415	5.0	50	14.8%
Missouri	51,743	304,384	17.0	21	55,266	319,611	17.3	19	6.8%
Montana	5,763	39,187	14.7	28	6,602	40,650	16.2	24	14.6%
Nebraska	8,802	95,131	9.3	42	9,831	98,816	9.9	41	11.7%
Nevada	36,202	116,012	31.2	4	35,534	115,506	30.8	3	-1.8%
New Hampshire	4,319	31,531	13.7	32	4,440	33,355	13.3	32	2.8%
New Jersey	69,043	313,939	22.0	13	71,637	349,359	20.5	14	3.8%
New Mexico	50,873	146,881	34.6	2	52,385	152,747	34.3	2	3.0%
New York	320,544	1,059,276	30.3	5	320,172	1,063,344	30.1	4	-0.1%
North Carolina	81,267	546,008	14.9	27	72,775	570,270	12.8	33	-10.4%
North Dakota	2,459	25,796	9.5	41	2,123	26,094	8.1	45	-13.7%
Ohio	61,308	523,795	11.7	37	69,292	562,665	12.3	34	13.0%
Oklahoma	11,720	253,177	4.6	50	13,116	266,287	4.9	51	11.9%
Oregon	36,349	177,323	20.5	18	34,381	187,698	18.3	16	-5.4%
Pennsylvania	121,937	492,438	24.8	11	125,791	510,655	24.6	9	3.2%
Rhode Island	7,520	47,814	15.7	25	8,060	46,527	17.3	19	7.2%
South Carolina	95,266	297,809	32.0	3	80,202	310,162	25.9	7	-15.8%
South Dakota	8,602	41,406	20.8	16	9,176	42,183	21.8	12	6.7%
Tennessee	39,985	375,870	10.6	38	42,204	366,065	11.5	36	5.5%
Texas	190,174	2,051,194	9.3	42	199,189	2,146,472	9.3	42	4.7%
Utah	32,290	127,001	25.4	8	19,889	136,767	14.5	28	-38.4%
Vermont	4,684	21,484	21.8	14	5,010	23,002	21.8	12	6.9%
Virginia	63,328	316,342	20.0	19	61,098	337,600	18.1	17	-3.5%
Washington	35,740	279,557	12.8	36	33,133	298,126	11.1	37	-7.3%
West Virginia	15,051	108,999	13.8	30	18,788	109,706	17.1	21	24.8%
Wisconsin	37,238	227,138	16.4	23	41,729	240,104	17.4	18	12.1%
Wyoming	3,588	20,885	17.2	20	3,590	21,631	16.6	22	0.1%
United States	**2,902,672**	**16,752,091**	**17.3**		**2,829,647**	**17,548,558**	**16.1**		**-2.5%**

* School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance.

** National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance and include participation in the Seamless Summer Option.

TABLE 2: Change in Summer Food Service Program and in National School Lunch Program Participation from July 2008 to July 2009 by State

State	Children in Summer Food Service Program			Children in National School Lunch Program		
	July 2008	July 2009	Change 2008 to 2009	July 2008	July 2009	Change 2008 to 2009
Alabama	19,323	19,522	1.0%	9,863	6,949	-29.6%
Alaska	1,815	2,388	31.5%	1,071	897	-16.3%
Arizona	6,997	8,746	25.0%	34,621	28,507	-17.7%
Arkansas	14,773	16,044	8.6%	6,845	7,948	16.1%
California	107,738	92,768	-13.9%	480,437	416,941	-13.2%
Colorado	9,360	8,798	-6.0%	5,649	4,984	-11.8%
Connecticut	14,647	13,733	-6.2%	18,787	21,695	15.5%
Delaware	10,287	11,474	11.5%	1,306	1,401	7.3%
District of Columbia	23,744	22,844	-3.8%	2,454	2,053	-16.3%
Florida	131,441	134,331	2.2%	22,232	10,585	-52.4%
Georgia	47,507	48,203	1.5%	52,966	64,380	21.6%
Hawaii	3,072	3,572	16.3%	7,551	3,017	-60.0%
Idaho	19,543	22,168	13.4%	1,331	835	-37.3%
Illinois	55,737	55,802	0.1%	54,115	49,229	-9.0%
Indiana	35,239	35,443	0.6%	10,590	9,427	-11.0%
Iowa	7,947	9,461	19.1%	3,565	3,628	1.8%
Kansas	8,590	8,786	2.3%	1,831	1,525	-16.7%
Kentucky	36,136	31,405	-13.1%	4,372	2,420	-44.7%
Louisiana	26,025	21,486	-17.4%	2,663	2,874	7.9%
Maine	7,223	8,234	14.0%	596	405	-32.1%
Maryland	42,542	51,199	20.3%	3,555	2,917	-18.0%
Massachusetts	41,237	42,417	2.9%	6,478	4,869	-24.8%
Michigan	42,244	45,298	7.2%	20,181	25,886	28.3%
Minnesota	21,507	22,617	5.2%	6,743	9,888	46.6%
Mississippi	10,791	12,553	16.3%	1,609	1,682	4.5%
Missouri	26,619	27,831	4.6%	25,125	27,435	9.2%
Montana	5,243	5,912	12.7%	520	691	32.8%
Nebraska	6,781	7,771	14.6%	2,021	2,060	1.9%
Nevada	4,598	4,934	7.3%	31,604	30,599	-3.2%
New Hampshire	3,567	3,714	4.1%	752	726	-3.5%
New Jersey	48,454	53,729	10.9%	20,589	17,908	-13.0%
New Mexico	35,701	33,240	-6.9%	15,172	19,145	26.2%
New York	264,753	262,182	-1.0%	55,791	57,990	3.9%
North Carolina	36,534	32,967	-9.8%	44,733	39,809	-11.0%
North Dakota	2,084	1,754	-15.8%	375	369	-1.6%
Ohio	50,080	56,508	12.8%	11,229	12,784	13.8%
Oklahoma	10,050	10,608	5.5%	1,670	2,508	50.2%
Oregon	31,721	29,334	-7.5%	4,628	5,047	9.0%
Pennsylvania	71,313	78,403	9.9%	50,623	47,388	-6.4%
Rhode Island	5,596	5,220	-6.7%	1,925	2,841	47.6%
South Carolina	58,351	37,321	-36.0%	36,915	42,881	16.2%
South Dakota	3,596	3,822	6.3%	5,006	5,355	7.0%
Tennessee	28,474	29,891	5.0%	11,511	12,313	7.0%
Texas	94,473	120,584	27.6%	95,701	78,605	-17.9%
Utah	11,978	11,922	-0.5%	20,312	7,967	-60.8%
Vermont	2,529	2,802	10.8%	2,155	2,208	2.4%
Virginia	48,788	51,531	5.6%	14,541	9,567	-34.2%
Washington	28,732	27,719	-3.5%	7,008	5,414	-22.7%
West Virginia	11,980	13,627	13.7%	3,071	5,161	68.0%
Wisconsin	33,374	37,488	12.3%	3,864	4,242	9.8%
Wyoming	2,230	2,320	4.1%	1,358	1,270	-6.5%
United States	**1,673,063**	**1,702,424**	**1.8%**	**1,229,610**	**1,127,223**	**-8.3%**

TABLE 3: Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Participation in July 2009 by State

State	Children in SFSP, July 2009	Children in 08-09 School Year NSLP*	Children in 2009 SFSP per 100 in 08-09 School Year NSLP*	Rank	Percent SFSP Contributes to Summer Nutrition Participation
Alabama	19,522	337,535	5.8	42	73.7%
Alaska	2,388	32,950	7.2	36	72.7%
Arizona	8,746	417,767	2.1	51	23.5%
Arkansas	16,044	222,448	7.2	37	66.9%
California	92,768	2,256,524	4.1	49	18.2%
Colorado	8,798	200,213	4.4	46	63.8%
Connecticut	13,733	137,467	10.0	24	38.8%
Delaware	11,474	43,866	26.2	2	89.1%
District of Columbia	22,844	31,256	73.1	1	91.8%
Florida	134,331	1,030,432	13.0	15	92.7%
Georgia	48,203	757,075	6.4	40	42.8%
Hawaii	3,572	47,621	7.5	35	54.2%
Idaho	22,168	87,565	25.3	3	96.4%
Illinois	55,802	688,919	8.1	33	53.1%
Indiana	35,443	367,061	9.7	26	79.0%
Iowa	9,461	142,262	6.7	39	72.3%
Kansas	8,786	161,850	5.4	45	85.2%
Kentucky	31,405	315,694	9.9	25	92.8%
Louisiana	21,486	363,372	5.9	41	88.2%
Maine	8,234	52,580	15.7	8	95.3%
Maryland	51,199	223,245	22.9	5	94.6%
Massachusetts	42,417	239,517	17.7	7	89.7%
Michigan	45,298	506,294	8.9	29	63.6%
Minnesota	22,617	223,227	10.1	22	69.6%
Mississippi	12,553	286,415	4.4	47	88.2%
Missouri	27,831	319,611	8.7	31	50.4%
Montana	5,912	40,650	14.5	14	89.5%
Nebraska	7,771	98,816	7.9	34	79.0%
Nevada	4,934	115,506	4.3	48	13.9%
New Hampshire	3,714	33,355	11.1	20	83.6%
New Jersey	53,729	349,359	15.4	11	75.0%
New Mexico	33,240	152,747	21.8	6	63.5%
New York	262,182	1,063,344	24.7	4	81.9%
North Carolina	32,967	570,270	5.8	43	45.3%
North Dakota	1,754	26,094	6.7	38	82.6%
Ohio	56,508	562,665	10.0	23	81.6%
Oklahoma	10,608	266,287	4.0	50	80.9%
Oregon	29,334	187,698	15.6	9	85.3%
Pennsylvania	78,403	510,655	15.4	12	62.3%
Rhode Island	5,220	46,527	11.2	19	64.8%
South Carolina	37,321	310,162	12.0	18	46.5%
South Dakota	3,822	42,183	9.1	28	41.6%
Tennessee	29,891	366,065	8.2	32	70.8%
Texas	120,584	2,146,472	5.6	44	60.5%
Utah	11,922	136,767	8.7	30	59.9%
Vermont	2,802	23,002	12.2	17	55.9%
Virginia	51,531	337,600	15.3	13	84.3%
Washington	27,719	298,126	9.3	27	83.7%
West Virginia	13,627	109,706	12.4	16	72.5%
Wisconsin	37,488	240,104	15.6	10	89.8%
Wyoming	2,320	21,631	10.7	21	64.6%
United States	**1,702,424**	**17,548,558**	**9.7**		**59.1%**

* School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance.

TABLE 4: Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2008 to July 2009 by State

State	Number of Sponsors			Number of Sites		
	July 2008	July 2009	Percent Change	July 2008	July 2009	Percent Change
Alabama	37	35	-5.4%	483	499	3.3%
Alaska	25	29	16.0%	63	104	65.1%
Arizona	34	36	5.9%	161	211	31.1%
Arkansas	106	114	7.5%	220	313	42.3%
California	173	194	12.1%	1,417	1,738	22.7%
Colorado	54	45	-16.7%	198	191	-3.5%
Connecticut	24	27	12.5%	225	239	6.2%
Delaware	20	20	0.0%	310	351	13.2%
District of Columbia	16	20	25.0%	329	270	-17.9%
Florida	106	111	4.7%	2,556	2,635	3.1%
Georgia	85	100	17.6%	1,441	1,531	6.2%
Hawaii	22	19	-13.6%	102	144	41.2%
Idaho	65	64	-1.5%	228	242	6.1%
Illinois	130	136	4.6%	1,196	1,297	8.4%
Indiana	130	182	40.0%	836	942	12.7%
Iowa	70	84	20.0%	210	206	-1.9%
Kansas	58	61	5.2%	216	203	-6.0%
Kentucky	90	162	80.0%	1,200	1,609	34.1%
Louisiana	81	85	4.9%	479	466	-2.7%
Maine	53	64	20.8%	128	157	22.7%
Maryland	41	47	14.6%	877	1,032	17.7%
Massachusetts	82	85	3.7%	812	864	6.4%
Michigan	147	184	25.2%	870	968	11.3%
Minnesota	71	79	11.3%	339	396	16.8%
Mississippi	58	81	39.7%	209	263	25.8%
Missouri	69	264	282.6%	505	880	74.3%
Montana	54	65	20.4%	139	186	33.8%
Nebraska	45	51	13.3%	190	101	-46.8%
Nevada	27	33	22.2%	87	102	17.2%
New Hampshire	26	18	-30.8%	93	99	6.5%
New Jersey	89	95	6.7%	1,020	1,011	-0.9%
New Mexico	56	58	3.6%	665	654	-1.7%
New York	284	292	2.8%	2,595	2,415	-6.9%
North Carolina	87	93	6.9%	777	768	-1.2%
North Dakota	25	23	-8.0%	34	34	0.0%
Ohio	177	201	13.6%	1,404	1,514	7.8%
Oklahoma	53	63	18.9%	223	312	39.9%
Oregon	107	110	2.8%	545	580	6.4%
Pennsylvania	227	221	-2.6%	1,949	1,921	-1.4%
Rhode Island	12	14	16.7%	145	148	2.1%
South Carolina	48	52	8.3%	1,021	1,045	2.4%
South Dakota	24	27	12.5%	50	50	0.0%
Tennessee	45	45	0.0%	968	1,030	6.4%
Texas	177	249	40.7%	1,909	2,551	33.6%
Utah	15	14	-6.7%	114	85	-25.4%
Vermont	32	35	9.4%	82	99	20.7%
Virginia	116	121	4.3%	1,385	1,474	6.4%
Washington	103	114	10.7%	562	584	3.9%
West Virginia	90	93	3.3%	364	408	12.1%
Wisconsin	98	107	9.2%	475	510	7.4%
Wyoming	16	18	12.5%	40	49	22.5%
United States	**3,880**	**4,540**	**17.0%**	**32,446**	**35,481**	**9.4%**

TABLE 5: Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches Served in June, July, and August* 2008 and 2009 by State

State	June 2008 SFSP Lunches	June 2009 SFSP Lunches	% Change	July 2008 SFSP Lunches	July 2009 SFSP Lunches	% Change	August 2008 SFSP Lunches	August 2009 SFSP Lunches	% Change
Alabama	617,317	613,339	-1%	425,115	429,485	1%	1,668	960	-42%
Alaska	38,443	62,210	62%	39,936	52,535	32%	13,143	21,589	64%
Arizona	480,041	520,512	8%	153,927	192,412	25%	9,650	11,110	15%
Arkansas	325,508	355,862	9%	324,996	352,972	9%	61,569	71,542	16%
California	2,041,066	815,507	-60%	2,370,246	2,040,903	-14%	666,875	640,716	-4%
Colorado	246,205	346,352	41%	205,912	193,546	-6%	13,971	6,723	-52%
Connecticut	0	20,373	N/A	322,227	302,136	-6%	59,084	96,392	63%
Delaware	94,100	99,644	6%	226,323	252,419	12%	83,604	167,725	101%
District of Columbia	119,560	90,197	-25%	522,372	502,567	-4%	165,871	122,030	-26%
Florida	2,010,617	2,243,392	12%	2,891,696	2,955,279	2%	257,777	518,686	101%
Georgia	1,202,954	1,294,836	8%	1,045,148	1,060,459	1%	88,130	61,225	-31%
Hawaii	79,138	104,549	32%	67,580	78,580	16%	817	367	-55%
Idaho	436,751	514,786	18%	429,939	487,685	13%	155,850	164,309	5%
Illinois	597,892	618,272	3%	1,226,223	1,227,634	0%	305,293	316,884	4%
Indiana	556,427	721,638	30%	775,260	779,747	1%	90,832	93,133	3%
Iowa	180,968	206,307	14%	174,831	208,149	19%	20,496	22,806	11%
Kansas	344,120	326,639	-5%	188,972	193,290	2%	1,356	3,996	195%
Kentucky	961,670	757,169	-21%	794,993	690,920	-13%	47,260	35,307	-25%
Louisiana	1,187,896	1,316,678	11%	572,555	472,690	-17%	128,272	7,338	-94%
Maine	8,665	4,805	-45%	158,915	181,137	14%	36,375	42,438	17%
Maryland	211,379	169,758	-20%	935,914	1,126,369	20%	151,093	138,827	-8%
Massachusetts	73,530	43,923	-40%	907,220	933,172	3%	409,699	439,730	7%
Michigan	314,997	378,798	20%	929,368	996,559	7%	261,725	361,658	38%
Minnesota	264,553	247,959	-6%	473,147	497,581	5%	92,513	124,833	35%
Mississippi	799,188	813,626	2%	237,393	276,168	16%	456	762	67%
Missouri	1,567,657	1,737,187	11%	585,608	612,274	5%	69,043	67,325	-2%
Montana	82,235	104,382	27%	115,350	130,056	13%	29,760	28,447	-4%
Nebraska	178,073	286,413	61%	149,184	170,956	15%	21,446	23,976	12%
Nevada	79,609	87,276	10%	101,163	108,555	7%	47,665	45,715	-4%
New Hampshire	7,308	9,011	23%	78,472	81,711	4%	38,679	36,124	-7%
New Jersey	13,719	6,771	-51%	1,065,992	1,182,044	11%	429,634	407,248	-5%
New Mexico	858,636	865,419	1%	785,425	731,275	-7%	14,711	34,668	136%
New York	147,655	220,588	49%	5,824,568	5,768,006	-1%	3,365,502	3,254,593	-3%
North Carolina	319,867	300,469	-6%	803,746	725,271	-10%	219,695	187,687	-15%
North Dakota	60,040	56,860	-5%	45,849	38,592	-16%	10,248	8,496	-17%
Ohio	729,460	806,671	11%	1,101,757	1,243,173	13%	363,244	355,667	-2%
Oklahoma	498,298	529,150	6%	221,105	233,372	6%	13,984	15,568	11%
Oregon	207,835	270,360	30%	697,852	645,351	-8%	217,229	251,819	16%
Pennsylvania	522,167	392,842	-25%	1,568,891	1,724,856	10%	743,180	744,591	0%
Rhode Island	13,995	5,031	-64%	123,101	114,829	-7%	63,614	58,641	-8%
South Carolina	1,176,510	675,039	-43%	1,283,728	821,056	-36%	390,628	218,183	-44%
South Dakota	74,991	77,673	4%	79,118	84,083	6%	32,436	32,672	1%
Tennessee	942,900	942,298	0%	626,436	657,604	5%	18,882	13,458	-29%
Texas	4,741,914	4,442,696	-6%	2,078,405	2,652,856	28%	898,459	1,279,084	42%
Utah	286,529	257,532	-10%	263,520	262,284	0%	82,806	70,228	-15%
Vermont	10,546	11,305	7%	55,646	61,646	11%	18,375	21,874	19%
Virginia	310,196	298,770	-4%	1,073,332	1,133,690	6%	363,124	490,124	35%
Washington	172,772	161,527	-7%	632,095	609,822	-4%	206,455	216,057	5%
West Virginia	89,867	88,483	-2%	263,558	299,790	14%	57,142	49,075	-14%
Wisconsin	195,357	209,959	7%	734,226	824,726	12%	180,817	171,634	-5%
Wyoming	38,292	43,658	14%	49,050	51,049	4%	14,832	10,479	-29%
United States	**26,519,413**	**25,574,501**	**-4%**	**36,807,385**	**37,453,321**	**2%**	**11,034,969**	**11,564,519**	**5%**

* States may serve lunches for a few days in June or August, but not have data in those months. This is because sponsors are allowed, if they do not serve for more than 10 days in those months, to claim those lunches in July to reduce paperwork.

TABLE 6: Estimated Number of Children Participating and Additional Federal Payments in July 2009 Summer Nutrition, if States Served 40 Children in Summer per 100 Served in School Year National School Lunch Program

State	Children in Summer Nutrition (School Lunch* & Summer Food Combined), July 2009	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 08-09 School Year NSLP**	Total Children Who Would Be in July Summer Nutrition if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School Year NSLP**	Additional Children Reached in July if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School Year NSLP**	Additional Federal Reimbursement if State Reached in July a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School Year NSLP***
Alabama	26,471	7.8	135,014	108,543	$7,474,295
Alaska	3,285	10.0	13,180	9,895	$681,356
Arizona	37,253	8.9	167,107	129,854	$8,941,764
Arkansas	23,993	10.8	88,979	64,987	$4,474,991
California	509,710	22.6	902,610	392,900	$27,055,081
Colorado	13,781	6.9	80,085	66,304	$4,565,689
Connecticut	35,429	25.8	54,987	19,558	$1,346,764
Delaware	12,874	29.3	17,546	4,672	$321,713
District of Columbia	24,897	79.7	--	--	--
Florida	144,916	14.1	412,173	267,256	$18,403,275
Georgia	112,583	14.9	302,830	190,247	$13,100,401
Hawaii	6,589	13.8	19,049	12,460	$857,980
Idaho	23,002	26.3	35,026	12,024	$827,958
Illinois	105,031	15.2	275,568	170,537	$11,743,176
Indiana	44,870	12.2	146,824	101,955	$7,020,616
Iowa	13,089	9.2	56,905	43,815	$3,017,135
Kansas	10,311	6.4	64,740	54,429	$3,748,003
Kentucky	33,825	10.7	126,278	92,452	$6,366,269
Louisiana	24,360	6.7	145,349	120,989	$8,331,274
Maine	8,638	16.4	21,032	12,394	$853,438
Maryland	54,115	24.2	89,298	35,183	$2,422,680
Massachusetts	47,286	19.7	95,807	48,520	$3,341,112
Michigan	71,185	14.1	202,518	131,333	$9,043,593
Minnesota	32,505	14.6	89,291	56,786	$3,910,273
Mississippi	14,235	5.0	114,566	100,331	$6,908,798
Missouri	55,266	17.3	127,844	72,579	$4,997,765
Montana	6,602	16.2	16,260	9,658	$665,049
Nebraska	9,831	9.9	39,527	29,696	$2,044,865
Nevada	35,534	30.8	46,202	10,669	$734,640
New Hampshire	4,440	13.3	13,342	8,902	$612,976
New Jersey	71,637	20.5	139,744	68,106	$4,689,802
New Mexico	52,385	34.3	61,099	8,714	$600,033
New York	320,172	30.1	425,338	105,166	$7,241,713
North Carolina	72,775	12.8	228,108	155,332	$10,696,192
North Dakota	2,123	8.1	10,438	8,315	$572,548
Ohio	69,292	12.3	225,066	155,775	$10,726,643
Oklahoma	13,116	4.9	106,515	93,399	$6,431,435
Oregon	34,381	18.3	75,079	40,698	$2,802,475
Pennsylvania	125,791	24.6	204,262	78,471	$5,403,533
Rhode Island	8,060	17.3	18,611	10,551	$726,514
South Carolina	80,202	25.9	124,065	43,863	$3,020,386
South Dakota	9,176	21.8	16,873	7,697	$529,986
Tennessee	42,204	11.5	146,426	104,222	$7,176,724
Texas	199,189	9.3	858,589	659,400	$45,406,263
Utah	19,889	14.5	54,707	34,818	$2,397,561
Vermont	5,010	21.8	9,201	4,191	$288,598
Virginia	61,098	18.1	135,040	73,942	$5,091,629
Washington	33,133	11.1	119,250	86,117	$5,930,030
West Virginia	18,788	17.1	43,882	25,095	$1,728,013
Wisconsin	41,729	17.4	96,042	54,312	$3,739,931
Wyoming	3,590	16.6	8,652	5,062	$348,571
United States	**2,829,647**	**16.1**	**7,019,423**	**4,189,776**	**$288,507,989**

* National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance and include participation in the Seamless Summer Option.

** School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance in school year 2008-2009.

*** This estimate is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed for each child each weekday only for lunch (not also breakfast or a snack) and at the lowest rate for a SFSP lunch ($3.13 per lunch). It also assumes that all participants are served for 22 weekdays in July 2009 (not counting the July 4th holiday).